

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: SORKIN, Felix L.

SERIAL NO.: 10/688,186

ART UNIT: 3635

FILED: October 20, 2003

EXAMINER: Bergeron, R. C.

TITLE: INTERSECTIONAL REINFORCING BAR SUPPORT WITH C-SHAPED CLAMPS

Amendment B: REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, previous Claims 1-20 and 21 -35 have been canceled and new Claims 36 - 42 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claims 21 and 23 - 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Padrum patent. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Padrum patent. Claims 26 and 27 were also rejected as being obvious over the Padrum patent. Claims 31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Padrum patent in view of the Hardy patent. Importantly, it was indicated that Claims 28 - 30 are "allowed" and that Claim 35 was "objected to" as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the prior art rejections, Applicant is desirous of securing patent protection for the present invention at an early date. As such, Applicant has revised the claim language so as to place the claims into a properly allowable form.

So as to provide consistency of numbering, previous allowed 28 - 30 have been reprinted and

renumbered herein as new Claims 36 - 38. No changes to these claims have been entered other than the claim dependency reference. In all other respects, Claims 36 - 38 are identical to previous Claims 28 - 30.

New independent Claim 39 corresponds to the limitations of previous independent Claim 31 and the limitations of "objected to" Claim 35. As such, independent Claim 39 should now be in a proper condition for allowance. Dependent Claims 40 - 42 correspond to the limitations of previous dependent Claims 32 - 34, respectively.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claims 36 and 39 are now in proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon these independent claims should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

November 21, 2006

Date

Customer No. 24106

/Andrew W. Chu/

John S. Egbert; Reg. No. 30,627
Andrew W. Chu; Reg. No. 46,625
Egbert Law Offices
412 Main Street, 7th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(713)224-8080
(713)223-4873 fax